

Application No. 10/695272  
Response to Office Action dated 10/03/2006

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

APR 20 2007

**REMARKS**

Applicants cancel claims 1-4 without prejudice or disclaimer, add new claims 17-19. Withdrawn claims 5, 8, 9, 12, 13, 15, 16 have been amended for consonance with the elected claims. Withdrawn claims 6, 7, 10, 11, and 14 have been canceled without disclaimer or prejudice. In amending and adding claims, Applicants have not added new matter; support in the originally filed specification for synchronously switching the forward/rearward application of PWM signals with the rearward/forward application of the PWM signals is given at page 13, lines 30-32; support for the noise voltages canceling out are given on page 11, lines 22-23; page 12, lines 10-11 and lines 21-22; page 13, lines 24-26, etc. Claims 5, 8, 9, 12, 13, and 15-19 are pending, of which claims 5, 8, 9, 12, 13, 15 and 16 are withdrawn.

The Examiner rejects claims 1-4 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph saying that the phrase "almost equal" is a relative term and hence, unclear. Applicants removed the objectionable language in preparing the new claims. The Examiner further states that it is unclear what is meant by "the PWM signal voltages and the scanning voltages are alternated synchronously to have a predetermined relationship with a frame cycle" in claim 4. Applicants prepared claim 18 to state that the "PWM signals and a scanning voltage are applied and switched synchronously to each of the scanning electrodes in a predetermined relationship within the frame cycle" and submit that claim 18 is definite. Applicants are not conceding the correctness of the rejection.

The Examiner further rejected claims 1-4 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph. Applicants have not used "the forward approach PWM signal voltages and the PWM signal voltages are scanned by each scanning electrode" in the new claims. The rejection is moot in view of amendments; Applicants are not conceding the correctness of the rejection.

Applicants traverse the rejection of claims 1-4 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Yasunishi '335. Yasunishi '335 does not teach or suggest that the rearward/forward approach combination and the forward/rearward approach combination are switched in every frame cycle, as required by claims 17 and 19. The diagrams of Fig. 10(d) of Yasunishi '335, referred to in the rejection as anticipating claims 1-4, do not

Application No. 10/695272  
Response to Office Action dated 10/03/2006

teach alternating between rearward/forward and forward/rearward every frame cycle between odd-numbered scanning electrodes and even-numbered scanning electrodes. Rather, Fig. 10(d) clearly shows that a first signal is a rearward signal and then the following signal is a forward signal, but all electrodes experience the exact same waveforms. In particular notice that C1M and C2M have the exact same waveform. Fig. 10(d) thus does not illustrate alternating waveforms between the odd-numbered and the even-numbered electrodes, as required by claims 17 and 19, let alone alternating between rearward/forward and forward/rearward application of the PWM signal voltages, required by claims 17 and 19.

At column 9, lines 27-39, Yasunishi '335 teaches that one data signal is applied to an odd-number column electrode and a second data signal is applied to the even-number column electrode at column 9, lines 27-39. However, consistent with the single-direction approach of Figure 10(d), Yasunishi '335 does not teach or suggest switching the forward/rearward approach with the rearward/forward approach between the odd- and even-numbered electrodes. Because there is no suggestion or disclosure of alternating between a rearward/forward and a forward/rearward approach between odd- and even-numbered electrodes, the rejection of claims 1 and 4 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) should be withdrawn.

Applicants request favorable reconsideration of this application. If the Examiner feels that a telephone call would expedite allowance of the claims and issuance of the patent, he is invited to telephone the Attorney for Applicants at the number below.



Dated: April 3, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

HAMRE, SCHUMANN, MUELLER &  
LARSON, P.C.  
P.O. Box 2902  
Minneapolis, MN 55402-0902  
(612) 455-3800

By: 

Douglas P. Mueller  
Reg. No. 30,300  
DPM/lis